



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

XO  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,406	06/24/2003	Pier Andrea Borea	PAT-0040-US-NP2	4184
57999	7590	07/06/2006	EXAMINER	
KING PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. 400 CROSSING BOULEVARD BRIDGEWATER, NJ 08807				GRAFFEO, MICHEL
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1614		

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/603,406	BOREA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	Art Unit Michel Graffeo	1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 April 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16,18-21 and 28-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-5 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 6-16,18-21 and 28-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.   |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12 Jan 04;4 oct 05</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

**DETAILED ACTION**

**Status of Action**

Claims 6-16, 18-21 and 28-31 are examined.

Applicant has amended claims 6-7, 11-12 and 18-21, withdrew claims 1-5, canceled claims 17 and 22-27 and added new claims 28-31 in the response filed 6 April 2006.

***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's arguments for the withdrawal of the Restriction requirement has been fully considered and is persuasive. Therefore, the requirement is withdrawn for reasons stated in Applicant's response dated 6 April 2006.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 9 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the

Art Unit: 1614

invention. There is no teaching in the instant Application or prior art for the making of the claimed compounds wherein A is a triazolo ring.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 6-8, 10-16, 18-19, 21 and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,210,917 to Carson et al. in view of US Patent No. 6,066,642 to Jacobson et al. and further in view of Baraldi et al. Pyrozolo[4,3-e]-1,2,4-triazolo[1,5-cl-pyrimidine derivatives as highly potent and selective human A3 adenosine receptor antagonists. Journal of Medicinal Chemistry. Vol 42 (1999) 4473-4478.

Art Unit: 1614

Carson et al. teaches a combination therapy comprising an adenosine-5'-triphosphate depleting agent to treat cancers such as breast and colon cancer (see col 12 lines 53-55) that are multidrug resistant, MDR, (see Abstract) with respect to vinca alkaloids, taxanes and antibiotics (see col 1 lines 46-51). Carson et al. additionally explain that the depletion of AMP and ATP negatively affects P-glycoprotein activity, which is linked to MDR.

Jacobson et al. teach the use of adenosine A3 receptor antagonists in the killing of cancer cells (in current claims 23-25; see col 63 Example 31) wherein the A3 receptor antagonists are used alone or in combination with other active agents (see col 16 lines 11-18).

Jacobson et al. do not specifically teach the use of a compound of the instant claims, MRE3008F20 for example.

Baraldi et al. teach that MRE3008F20 is an adenosine A3 receptor antagonists (in current claims 23-25; see page 4476 compound #7).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the above references and as combined would teach the invention as claimed. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the above references because a known adenosine A3 receptor antagonist such as MRE3008F20 would be obvious to one skilled in the art over Jacobson et al. which teaches the use of adenosine A3 receptor antagonists to treat cancer. Further, Carson et al. teach that the depletion of adenosine is linked to P-glycoprotein dependent MDR. To that end, all three references teach that a reduction in adenosine is efficacious in the treatment of cancer. Thus, the

combined references teach and make prima facie obvious how to use the claimed invention at the time that it was made.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 6-16, 18-21 and 28-31 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-27 of copending Application No. 10/600116.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully claimed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: a method of synergistically

enhancing the chemotherapeutic treatment of cancer expressing adenosine A3 receptors comprising administering to a mammal in need thereof an effective amount of a high affinity adenosine A3 receptor antagonist either prior to or during administration of a chemotherapeutic cancer agent wherein the cancer has multi-drug resistance that is P-glycoprotein dependent.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Conclusion***

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michel Graffeo whose telephone number is 571-272-8505. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am to 5:30pm Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on 571-272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

22 June 2006  
MG

*Ardin H. Marschel 6/24/06*  
**ARDIN H. MARSCHEL**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**